arXiv:1610.08577v1 [math.AP] 27 Oct 2016

Time-dependence of the threshold function in the perfect plasticity model

Takeshi Fukao
Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Education
Kyoto University of Education
1 Fujinomori, Fukakusa, Fushimi-ku, Kyoto 612-8522, Japan
E-mail: fukao@kyokyo-u.ac.jp

Risei Kano
Research and Education Faculty, Humanities and Social Science Cluster
Kochi University
2-5-1 Akebono-cho, Kochi 780-8520, Japan
E-mail: kano@kochi-u.ac.jp

Abstract

This paper discusses the time-dependence of the threshold function in the perfect plasticity model. In physical terms, it is natural that the threshold function depends on some unknown variable. Therefore, it is meaningful to discuss the well-posedness of this function under the weaker assumption of time-dependence. Time-dependence is also interesting from the viewpoint of the abstract evolution equation. To prove the existence of a solution to the perfect plasticity model, the recent abstract theory under the continuous class with respect to time is used.

Keywords: Time dependence, evolution inclusion, perfect plasticity.

AMS (MOS) subject classification: 35K61, 35K25, 35D30, 80A22.

1 Introduction

The time-dependent evolution inclusion is an interesting subject in the theory of the abstract evolution equations. Here, *time-dependence* includes the time-dependent effective domain, i.e. we consider the following evolution inclusion:

$$u'(t) + \partial\varphi^t\big(u(t)\big) \ni f(t) \quad \text{in } H, \text{ for a.a. } t \in (0,T), \quad u(0) = u_0 \quad \text{in } H, \tag{1.1}$$

where H is a real Hilbert space and $T > 0$ is a finite time; $\partial\varphi^t$ is a subdifferential of some proper, lower semi-continuous, convex functional φ^t on H, which depends on time

$t \in [0,T]$. More precisely, the effective domain $D(\varphi^t) \subset H$ moves depending on time. The dynamics have some constraints that depend on time. The well-posedness of the above evolution inclusion has been studied in many papers [1, 2, 4, 8, 11, 12, 27] under various settings of the time-dependence. In this paper, we recall one result given by Fukao–Kenmochi [8] in terms of a weakly time-dependent constraint. Moreover, we will apply this result to a version of the classical perfect plasticity problem [7]. The goal of this study is to apply the theory of quasivariational inequality (see, e.g. [10, 17, 14, 25]) to the hardening problem. In this point, the special case of (1.1) is very important, namely $\varphi^t := I_{K(t)}$, where $I_{K(t)}$ is the indicator function of some closed convex set $K(t)$, which is called the *Moreau sweeping process*. In the 1970s, J. J. Moreau studied a class of evolution inclusion of the form

$$u'(t) + \partial I_{K(t)}\big(u(t)\big) \ni 0 \quad \text{in } H, \text{ for a.a. } t \in (0,T), \quad u(0) = u_0 \quad \text{in } H,$$

(see, e.g. [19, 20]). This problem has been studied in various scenarios (see, e.g. [5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 26]).

In Section 2, we introduce the original problem of perfect plasticity (see, e.g. [7, 13, 24]). After setting function spaces with some useful properties, we define our solution for three cases. Moreover, we give three theorems as examples of the abstract theory of evolution inclusion.

In Section 3, to prove the main theorem, we recall the abstract theory of evolution equations with time-dependence. The first theorem (Theorem 2.1) is a consequence of the well-known theory. Moreover, using this result, we can discuss the well-posedness of the weak variational inequality (Theorem 2.2). In both cases, we need to consider approximations under two parameters, $\kappa, \nu > 0$.

In Section 4, we consider the problem without the approximate parameter $\kappa > 0$. In this case, the problem is the same as the well-known Moreau sweeping process.

A detailed index of sections and subsections is as follows:

1. Introduction

2. Main theorems

   2.1. Original problem

   2.2. Notation

   2.3. Definition of the solution and theorem

3. Proof of the main theorems

   3.1 Evolution inclusion with time-dependent domain

   3.2 Proof of Theorem 2.1

   3.3 Proof of Theorem 2.2

4. Pure perfect plasticity model

   4.1 Auxiliary problems

   4.2 Proof of Theorem 2.3

2 Main theorems

In this paper, we consider the time-dependence of the constraint related to the perfect plasticity model. In this section, we state the main results.

2.1 Original problem

In this subsection, we recall the well-known classical problem of perfect plasticity [7]. The unknown functions $\boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{u}(t,x)$ and $\sigma = \sigma(t,x)$ describe the displacement and stress, respectively, in the interior of a medium that occupies a smooth region $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. The boundary $\Gamma := \partial\Omega$ consists of $\Gamma = \Gamma_D \cup \Gamma_N$, where $\Gamma_D \cap \Gamma_N = \emptyset$ with $|\Gamma_D| > 0$ and $|\Gamma_N| > 0$. Moreover, $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ denotes the unit normal vector outward from Γ. The function $\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{u}) := \{\varepsilon_{ij}\}$ represents the strain with respect to deformation, defined by $\varepsilon_{ij} := (1/2)((\partial u_i/\partial x_j) + (\partial u_j/\partial x_i))$ for $i,j = 1,2,3$. We wish to find $\boldsymbol{v} := \partial\boldsymbol{u}/\partial t$ and σ satisfying

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{v}}{\partial t} = \mathbf{div}\sigma + \boldsymbol{f} \quad \text{in } Q := (0,T)\times\Omega, \tag{2.1}$$

$$\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial t} + \partial I_Z(\sigma + \sigma_*) \ni \varepsilon(\boldsymbol{v}) + h \quad \text{in } Q, \tag{2.2}$$

under some initial and boundary conditions, where $\boldsymbol{f} : Q \to \mathbb{R}^3$, $h : Q \to \mathbb{R}^{3\times3}_{\rm sym}$, and $\sigma^* : Q \to \mathbb{R}^{3\times3}_{\rm sym}$ are given functions in Q. With the help of h and σ_*, we can translate the problem to the homogeneous boundary value problem. The operator $\mathbf{div}$ is defined by $\mathbf{div}\tau := (\mathrm{div}\tau_{1\cdot}, \mathrm{div}\tau_{2\cdot}, \mathrm{div}\tau_{3\cdot})$ for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times3}_{\rm sym}$. The first equation (2.1) is derived by the conservation law of momentum. The second equation (2.2) ensures the property of perfect plasticity, where we assume the sum decomposition of strain. In relation (2.2), Z is a time-dependent closed convex set defined by $Z := \{\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times3}_{\rm sym} : (1/2)|\tau^D|^2 \le g\}$, where $\tau^D_{ij} := \tau_{ij} - (1/3)\sum_{k=1}^3 \tau_{kk}\delta_{ij}$ for $i,j = 1,2,3$ and $|\tau|^2 := \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \tau_{ij}\tau_{ij}$ for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times3}_{\rm sym}$. Moreover, g is a positive constant that represents the threshold value of the elasto-plasticity. ∂I_Z is the subdifferential of I_Z. In this paper, we consider the problem in which the threshold constant g is replaced by the function $g : [0,T]\times\Omega \to (0,\infty)$. We will focus on the case of an unknown dependent threshold $g(\sigma)$, which is a more interesting setting. Then, (2.2) becomes the quasivariational inequality (see, e.g. [3, 6, 25]).

2.2 Notation

Hereafter, we use the following notation: $\boldsymbol{H} := L^2(\Omega)^3$, $\boldsymbol{V} := \{\boldsymbol{z} \in H^1(\Omega)^3 : \boldsymbol{z} = \boldsymbol{0}$ a.e. on $\Gamma_D\}$, with their inner products $(\cdot,\cdot)_{\boldsymbol{H}}$, $(\cdot,\cdot)_{\boldsymbol{V}}$, and the norm $|\cdot|_{\boldsymbol{H}}$, where $|\cdot|_{\boldsymbol{V}}$ is defined by

$$|\boldsymbol{z}|_{\boldsymbol{V}} := \left\{ \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_\Omega \left| \frac{\partial z_i}{\partial x_j} \right|^2 dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{z} \in \boldsymbol{V}.$$

Denote the dual space of $\boldsymbol{V}$ by $\boldsymbol{V}^*$ with the duality pair $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\boldsymbol{V}^*,\boldsymbol{V}}$. Moreover, we define the following bilinear form: $((\cdot,\cdot)) : \boldsymbol{V}\times\boldsymbol{V} \to \mathbb{R}$

$$((\boldsymbol{z},\tilde{\boldsymbol{z}})) := \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \int_\Omega \frac{\partial z_i}{\partial x_j}\frac{\partial \tilde{z}_i}{\partial x_j} dx \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{z},\tilde{\boldsymbol{z}} \in \boldsymbol{V}.$$

We also define $\mathbb{H} := \{\tau := \{\tau_{ij}\} : \tau_{ij} \in L^2(\Omega),\ \tau_{ij} = \tau_{ji}\}$, $\mathbb{V} := \{\tau \in \mathbb{H} : \mathbf{div}\tau \in \boldsymbol{H}, \tau_{i\cdot}\cdot\boldsymbol{\nu} = 0 \text{ a.e. on } \Gamma_N\}$ with their inner products

$$(\tau, \tilde{\tau})_{\mathbb{H}} := \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \int_\Omega \tau_{ij}\tilde{\tau}_{ij}dx \quad \text{for all } \tau, \tilde{\tau} \in \mathbb{H},$$

$$(\tau, \tilde{\tau})_{\mathbb{V}} := (\tau, \tilde{\tau})_{\mathbb{H}} + (\mathbf{div}\tau, \mathbf{div}\tilde{\tau})_{\boldsymbol{H}} = (\tau, \tilde{\tau})_{\mathbb{H}} + \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \int_\Omega \frac{\partial \tau_{ij}}{\partial x_j}\frac{\partial \tilde{\tau}_{ij}}{\partial x_j}dx \quad \text{for all } \tau, \tilde{\tau} \in \mathbb{V}.$$

The following convex constraint plays an important role in this paper. For each $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\tilde{K}(t) := \left\{\tau \in \mathbb{H} : \frac{1}{2}\left|\tau^D(x)\right|^2 \le g(t, x) \quad \text{for a.a. } x \in \Omega\right\}, \quad K(t) := \tilde{K}(t) - \sigma_*(t).$$

Originally, we considered $\boldsymbol{v} = h_D$ on $(0, T) \times \Gamma_D$ and $\sigma\cdot\boldsymbol{\nu} = \boldsymbol{h}_N$ on $(0, T) \times \Gamma_N$ as the boundary conditions with some given data h_D and $\boldsymbol{h}_N$. We assume that, thanks to some suitable functions σ_* and h, these can be translated to homogeneous boundary conditions.

Finally, we recall an important relation. For each $\boldsymbol{z} \in \boldsymbol{V}$, $\tau \in \mathbb{V}$, the following relation holds:

$$\big(\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{z}), \tau\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + (\mathbf{div}\tau, \boldsymbol{z})_{\boldsymbol{H}} = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

This is called the Gauss–Green relation.

2.3 Definition of the solution and theorem

Under these settings, we now state our problem in the variational formulation:

Definition 2.1. *For each $\kappa > 0$ and $\nu > 0$, the pair $(\boldsymbol{v}, \sigma)$ is called a solution in the sense of variational inequality if*

$$\begin{gathered}\boldsymbol{v} \in H^1(0, T; \boldsymbol{H}) \cap L^\infty(0, T; \boldsymbol{V}) \cap L^2\big(0, T; H^2(\Omega)^3\big),\\ \sigma \in H^1(0, T; \mathbb{H}) \cap L^2(0, T; \mathbb{V}), \quad \sigma(t) \in K(t) \quad \textit{for all } t \in [0, T],\end{gathered}$$

and they satisfy

$$\begin{gathered}\big(\boldsymbol{v}'(t), \boldsymbol{z}\big)_{\boldsymbol{H}} + \nu\big(\big(\boldsymbol{v}(t), \boldsymbol{z}\big)\big) - \big(\mathbf{div}\big(\sigma(t)\big), \boldsymbol{z}\big)_{\boldsymbol{H}} = \big(\boldsymbol{f}(t), \boldsymbol{z}\big)_{\boldsymbol{H}} \quad \textit{for all } \boldsymbol{z} \in \boldsymbol{V},\\ \big(\sigma'(t), \sigma(t) - \tau\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + \kappa\big(\sigma(t), \sigma(t) - \tau\big)_{\mathbb{V}} - \big(\varepsilon\big(\boldsymbol{v}(t)\big), \sigma(t) - \tau\big)_{\mathbb{H}}\\ \le \big(h(t), \sigma(t) - \tau\big)_{\mathbb{H}} \quad \textit{for all } \tau \in K(t) \cap \mathbb{V}\end{gathered}$$

for a.a. $t \in (0, T)$ with $\boldsymbol{v}(0) = \boldsymbol{v}_0$ in $\boldsymbol{H}$ and $\sigma(0) = \sigma_0$ in $\mathbb{H}$.

Hereafter, we assume that

(A1) $\boldsymbol{f} \in L^2(0, T; \boldsymbol{H})$ and $h \in L^2(0, T; \mathbb{H})$;

(A2) $\boldsymbol{v}_0 \in \boldsymbol{V}$ and $\sigma_0 \in K(0) \cap \mathbb{V}$;

(A3) $\sigma_* \in H^1(0,T;\mathbb{V})$;

(A4) $g \in H^1(0,T;C(\overline{\Omega}))$;

(A5) There exist two constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that

$$0 < C_1 \le g(t,x) \le C_2 \quad \text{for all } (t,x) \in Q.$$

From the definition of $K(t)$, we see that $-\sigma_*(t) \in K(t)$ for all $t \in [0,T]$. Our first theorem is as follows:

Theorem 2.1. *Under assumptions* (A1)–(A5)*, there exists a unique solution* $(\boldsymbol{v}, \sigma)$ *in the sense of variational inequality.*

Remark. Under assumptions (A4) and (A5), $\{K(t)\}_{t\in[0,T]}$ is a member of $\mathfrak{K}_S$ in the sense of [8, Section 2.].

To relax assumption (A4) on g with respect to time regularity, we recall the concept of the weak variational formulation:

Definition 2.2. *For each* $\kappa > 0$ *and* $\nu > 0$*, the pair* $(\boldsymbol{v}, \sigma)$ *is called a solution in the sense of weak variational inequality if*

$$\begin{gathered}\boldsymbol{v} \in H^1(0,T;\boldsymbol{H}) \cap L^\infty(0,T;\boldsymbol{V}) \cap L^2\big(0,T;H^2(\Omega)^3\big),\\ \sigma \in C\big([0,T];\mathbb{H}\big) \cap L^2(0,T;\mathbb{V}), \quad \sigma(t) \in K(t) \quad \text{for a.a. } t \in [0,T],\end{gathered}$$

and they satisfy

$$\big(\boldsymbol{v}'(t), \boldsymbol{z}\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + \nu\big(\big(\boldsymbol{v}(t), \boldsymbol{z}\big)\big) - \big(\mathbf{div}\sigma(t), \boldsymbol{z}\big)_{\boldsymbol{H}} = \big(\boldsymbol{f}(t), \boldsymbol{z}\big)_{\boldsymbol{H}} \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{z} \in \boldsymbol{V}, \tag{2.4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^t \big(\eta'(s), \sigma(s) - \eta(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds + \kappa \int_0^t \big(\sigma(s), \sigma(s) - \eta(s)\big)_{\mathbb{V}} ds\\ &\quad - \int_0^t \big(\varepsilon\big(\boldsymbol{v}(s)\big), \sigma(s) - \eta(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds + \frac{1}{2}\big|\sigma(t) - \eta(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2\\ &\le \int_0^t \big(h(s), \sigma(s) - \eta(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds + \frac{1}{2}\big|\sigma_0 - \eta(0)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \quad \text{for all } \eta \in \mathcal{K}_0,\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

for a.a. $t \in (0,T)$ *with* $\boldsymbol{v}(0) = \boldsymbol{v}_0$ *in* $\boldsymbol{H}$ *and* $\sigma(0) = \sigma_0$ *in* $\mathbb{H}$*, where*

$$\mathcal{K}_0 := \big\{\eta \in H^1(0,T;\mathbb{H}) \cap L^2(0,T;\mathbb{V}) : \eta(t) \in K(t) \quad \text{for a.a. } t \in (0,T)\big\}.$$

We assume the weaker condition (A4′) in place of (A4):

(A4′) $g \in C(\overline{Q})$.

Theorem 2.2. *Under assumptions* (A1)–(A3)*,* (A4′)*, and* (A5)*, there exists a unique solution* $(\boldsymbol{v}, \sigma)$ *in the sense of weak variational inequality.*

Remark. Under assumptions (A4′) and (A5), $\{K(t)\}_{t\in[0,T]}$ is a member of $\mathfrak{K}_W$ in the sense of [8, Section 2.].

Let us neglect the parameter $\kappa > 0$. In this case, the problem is the same as the *Moreau sweeping process*.

Definition 2.3. *For each $\nu > 0$, the pair $(\boldsymbol{v}, \sigma)$ is called a solution of the pure perfect plasticity model if*

$$\begin{gathered}\boldsymbol{v} \in H^1(0,T;\boldsymbol{V}^*) \cap L^\infty(0,T;\boldsymbol{H}) \cap L^2\big(0,T;\boldsymbol{V}\big),\\ \sigma \in H^1(0,T;\mathbb{H}), \quad \sigma(t) \in K(t) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0,T],\end{gathered}$$

and they satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}&\big\langle \boldsymbol{v}'(t), \boldsymbol{z}\big\rangle_{\boldsymbol{V}^*,\boldsymbol{V}} + \nu\big(\big(\boldsymbol{v}(t), \boldsymbol{z}\big)\big) + \big(\sigma(t), \varepsilon(\boldsymbol{z})\big)_{\mathbb{H}} = \big(\boldsymbol{f}(t), \boldsymbol{z}\big)_{\boldsymbol{H}} \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{z} \in \boldsymbol{V},\\ &\big(\sigma'(t), \sigma(t) - \tau\big)_{\mathbb{H}} - \big(\varepsilon\big(\boldsymbol{v}(t)\big), \sigma(t) - \tau\big)_{\mathbb{H}} \le \big(h(t), \sigma(t) - \tau\big)_{\mathbb{H}} \quad \text{for all } \tau \in K(t)\end{aligned}$$

for a.a. $t \in (0,T)$ with $\boldsymbol{v}(0) = \boldsymbol{v}_0$ in $\boldsymbol{H}$ and $\sigma(0) = \sigma_0$ in $\mathbb{H}$.

We replace (A3) by (A3′):

(A3′) $\sigma_* \in H^1(0,T;\mathbb{H})$.

Our last theorem is as follows:

Theorem 2.3. *Under assumptions* (A1), (A2), (A3′), (A4), *and* (A5), *there exists a unique solution $(\boldsymbol{v}, \sigma)$ of the pure perfect plasticity model.*

3 Proof of the main theorems

In this section, we recall the known results with respect to the time-dependent evolution inclusion. Moreover, we apply them to prove our main theorems.

3.1 Evolution inclusion with time-dependent domain

In this subsection, we recall the result given by Kenmochi [12] and apply it to the proof of Theorem 2.1. For this purpose, we describe the solvability of the evolution inclusion generated by the subdifferential operator with a time-dependent domain. For the family $\{\phi^t\} := \{\phi^t\}_{t\in[0,T]}$ of time-dependent, proper, lower semicontinuous, and convex functionals on the Hilbert space H, let us consider the following form:

$$u'(t) + \partial\phi^t\big(u(t)\big) \ni f(t) \quad \text{in } H, \text{ for a.a. } t \in (0,T), \quad u(0) = u_0 \quad \text{in } H, \tag{3.1}$$

where $f \in L^2(0,T;H)$ and $u_0 \in H$ are given functions and $\partial\phi^t$ is the subdifferential of ϕ^t in H. We introduce a proposition for the existence of solutions of (3.1) under the following condition (H) for $\{\phi^t\}$:

(H) For each $r > 0$, there exist $\alpha_r \in L^2(0,T)$ and $\beta_r \in L^1(0,T)$ satisfying the following property: For each $s,t \in [0,T]$ with $s \le t$ and $z \in D(\phi^s)$ with $|z|_H \le r$, there exists $\tilde{z} \in D(\phi^t)$ such that

$$|\tilde{z} - z|_H \le \left(\int_s^t \alpha_r(l)dl\right)\left(1 + \phi^s(z)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$\phi^t(\tilde{z}) - \phi^s(z) \le \left(\int_s^t \beta_r(l)dl\right)\big(1 + \phi^s(z)\big). \tag{3.3}$$

Proposition 3.1. [12, Kenmochi] *Assume that $\{\phi^t\}$ satisfies condition* (H)*. Then, for each $u_0 \in \overline{D(\phi^0)}$ and $f \in L^2(0,T;H)$, there exists a unique $u \in C([0,T];H)$ with*

$$\sqrt{t}u' \in L^2(0,T;H), \quad \sup_{t\in[0,T]} t\phi^t\big(u(t)\big) < \infty.$$

such that u satisfies (3.1)*. Moreover, if $u_0 \in D(\phi^0)$, then*

$$u' \in L^2(0,T;H), \quad \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \phi^t\big(u(t)\big) < \infty.$$

To apply the above proposition to our problem, we choose the functionals $\psi : \boldsymbol{H} \to [0,\infty]$ and $\varphi : \mathbb{H} \to [0,\infty]$ given by

$$\psi(\boldsymbol{z}) := \begin{cases} \dfrac{\nu}{2}((\boldsymbol{z},\boldsymbol{z})) & \text{if } \boldsymbol{z} \in \boldsymbol{V}, \\ \infty & \text{if } \boldsymbol{z} \in \boldsymbol{H} \setminus \boldsymbol{V}, \end{cases} \qquad \varphi(\tau) := \begin{cases} \dfrac{\kappa}{2}|\tau|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 & \text{if } \tau \in \mathbb{V}, \\ \infty & \text{if } \tau \in \mathbb{V} \setminus \mathbb{H}. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, for each $t \in [0,T]$, we define $\varphi^t := \varphi + I_{K(t)}$, where $I_{K(t)}$ is the indicator function on $K(t)$. Now, it is possible to reconstruct our problem as the following system of Cauchy problems.

$$\boldsymbol{v}'(t) + \partial\psi\big(\boldsymbol{v}(t)\big) + E_1\sigma(t) = \boldsymbol{f}(t) \quad \text{in } \boldsymbol{V}^*, \text{ for a.a. } t \in (0,T), \tag{3.4}$$

$$\sigma'(t) + \partial\varphi^t\big(\sigma(t)\big) + E_2\boldsymbol{v}(t) \ni h(t) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{H}, \text{ for a.a. } t \in (0,T), \tag{3.5}$$

$$\boldsymbol{v}(0) = \boldsymbol{v}_0 \quad \text{in } \boldsymbol{H}, \quad \sigma(0) = \sigma_0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{H}, \tag{3.6}$$

where it is obvious that $D(\partial\psi) = \boldsymbol{V} \cap H^2(\Omega)^3$ and $\partial\psi(\boldsymbol{z}) = -\Delta\boldsymbol{z}$. Moreover, $E_1 : \mathbb{V} \to \boldsymbol{H}$ is defined by $E_1\tau := -\mathbf{div}\tau$ for all $\tau \in \mathbb{V}$, and $E_2 : \boldsymbol{V} \to \mathbb{H}$ is $E_2\boldsymbol{z} := -\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{z})$ for all $\boldsymbol{z} \in \boldsymbol{V}$.

We have the following lemma:

Lemma 3.1. *For each $t \in (0,T)$, the function φ^t is proper, lower semicontinuous, and convex on $\mathbb{H}$, and $\partial\varphi^t$ is characterized as follows: For each $\tau \in D(\varphi^t) = K(t) \cap \mathbb{V}$, $\tau^* \in \partial\varphi^t(\tau)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ if and only if*

$$(\tau^*, \tilde{\tau} - \tau)_{\mathbb{H}} \le \kappa(\tau, \tilde{\tau} - \tau)_{\mathbb{V}} \quad \textit{for all } \tilde{\tau} \in K(t) \cap \mathbb{V}. \tag{3.7}$$

Moreover, $\{\varphi^t\}$ satisfies condition (H)*.*

Proof. First, we show that φ^t is a lower semicontinuous functional on $\mathbb{H}$. Let $\{\tau_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset D(\varphi^t) = K(t) \cap \mathbb{V}$; $\tau_n \to \tau$ in $\mathbb{H}$ as $n \to \infty$. If $R := \liminf_{n\to\infty} \varphi^t(\tau_n) = \infty$, then it is obvious. Thus, we assume $R < \infty$. We can take a subsequence $\{\tau_{n_k}\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $\{\tau_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\varphi^t(\tau_{n_k}) \to R \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \quad \tau_{n_k} \to \tau \quad \text{weakly in } \mathbb{V}, \text{ as } k \to \infty.$$

As $K(t) \cap \mathbb{V}$ is a convex and weakly closed set in $\mathbb{V}$, τ is surely an element of the set $K(t) \cap \mathbb{V}$. Therefore, by the lower semicontinuity of $\tilde{\varphi}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\liminf_{n\to\infty} \varphi^t(\tau_n) &= \liminf_{k\to\infty} \varphi^t(\tau_{n_k}) \\
&= \liminf_{k\to\infty} \big(\tilde{\varphi}(\tau_{n_k}) + I_{K(t)}(\tau_{n_k})\big) \\
&\geq \tilde{\varphi}(\tau) + I_{K(t)}(\tau) \\
&= \varphi^t(\tau).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, for each $\tau \in D(\varphi^t) = K(t) \cap \mathbb{V}$, take $\tau^* \in \partial\varphi^t(\tau)$ in $\mathbb{H}$. From the definition of the subdifferential,

$$(\tau^*, \bar{\tau} - \tau)_{\mathbb{H}} \leq \frac{\kappa}{2}|\bar{\tau}|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 - \frac{\kappa}{2}|\tau|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 \quad \text{for all } \bar{\tau} \in K(t) \cap \mathbb{V}.$$

Here, for each $\tilde{\tau} \in K(t) \cap \mathbb{V}$ and $r \in (0,1)$, substituting $\bar{\tau} := r\tilde{\tau} + (1-r)\tau \in K(t) \cap \mathbb{V}$, we have

$$r(\tau^*, \tilde{\tau} - \tau)_{\mathbb{H}} \leq \kappa r(\tau, \tilde{\tau} - \tau)_{\mathbb{V}} + \frac{\kappa}{2} r^2 (\tilde{\tau} - \tau, \tilde{\tau} - \tau)_{\mathbb{V}}.$$

Dividing this by r and letting $r \to 0$, we obtain (3.7). Finally, from the definition of $K(s)$, we see that for each $\tau \in K(s) \cap \mathbb{V}$, there exists $\tilde{\tau} \in \tilde{K}(s)$ such that $\tau = \tilde{\tau} - \sigma_*(s)$. Using assumptions (A4) and (A5), there exists $T_0 \in (0, T]$ such that

$$\big|g(t) - g(s)\big|_{C(\overline{\Omega})} < C_1$$

for all $s, t \in (0, T)$ with $|t - s| < T_0$. Now, we take

$$\tilde{\tau}_* := \left(1 - \frac{1}{C_1}\big|g(t) - g(s)\big|_{C(\overline{\Omega})}\right) \tilde{\tau}.$$

Then, because $\tilde{\tau} = \tau + \sigma_*(t) \in \mathbb{V}$ and $\tilde{\tau} \in \tilde{K}(s)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|\tilde{\tau}_*^D\big|^2 &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{C_1}\big|g(t) - g(s)\big|_{C(\overline{\Omega})}\right)^2 \big|\tilde{\tau}^D\big|^2 \\
&\leq 2\left(1 - \frac{1}{C_1}\big|g(t) - g(s)\big|_{C(\overline{\Omega})}\right) g(s) \\
&\leq 2g(s) - \frac{2g(s)}{C_1}\big|g(t) - g(s)\big|_{C(\overline{\Omega})} \\
&\leq 2g(s) - 2g(t) + 2g(t) - 2\big|g(t) - g(s)\big|_{C(\overline{\Omega})} \\
&\leq 2g(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\tilde{\tau}_* \in \tilde{K}(t) \cap \mathbb{V}$, that is, $\tau_* := \tilde{\tau}_* - \sigma_*(t)$ is an element of $K(t) \cap \mathbb{V}$. Next, we show that $\{\varphi^t\}$ satisfies condition (H). For each $\tau \in K(s)$, we take τ_* and $\tilde{\tau}_*$ to be the same as above, and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|\tau_* - \tau|_{\mathbb{H}} &\le |\tilde{\tau}_* - \tilde{\tau}|_{\mathbb{H}} + \big|\sigma_*(t) - \sigma_*(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}} \\
&\le \frac{1}{C_1}\big|g(t) - g(s)\big|_{C(\overline{\Omega})} + \big|\sigma_*(t) - \sigma_*(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}} \\
&\le \int_s^t \left(\frac{1}{C_1}\big|g'(l)\big|_{C(\overline{\Omega})} + \big|\sigma_*'(l)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}\right) dl.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for each $r > 0$, we can take $\alpha_r(\cdot) := \alpha(\cdot) := (1/C_1)|g'(\cdot)|_{C(\overline{\Omega})} + |\sigma_*'(\cdot)|_{\mathbb{H}}$, and then $\alpha \in L^2(0,T)$ and

$$|\tau_* - \tau|_{\mathbb{H}} \le \int_s^t \alpha(l) dl, \tag{3.8}$$

that is, (3.2) is satisfied. Additionally, setting $\theta := 1 - (1/C_1)|g(t) - g(s)|_{C(\overline{\Omega})}$, we have $\theta < 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi^t(\tau_*) &= \frac{\kappa}{2}\theta^2(\tilde{\tau},\tilde{\tau})_{\mathbb{V}} - \kappa\theta\big(\tilde{\tau}, \sigma_*(t)\big)_{\mathbb{V}} + \frac{\kappa}{2}\big(\sigma_*(t), \sigma_*(t)\big)_{\mathbb{V}}, \\
\varphi^s(\tau) &= \frac{\kappa}{2}(\tilde{\tau},\tilde{\tau})_{\mathbb{V}} - \kappa\big(\tilde{\tau}, \sigma_*(s)\big)_{\mathbb{V}} + \frac{\kappa}{2}\big(\sigma_*(s), \sigma_*(s)\big)_{\mathbb{V}}
\end{aligned}$$

from the definition of φ^t and φ^s. Thus, we have the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varphi^t(\tau_*) - \varphi^s(\tau) \\
&\le \kappa|\tilde{\tau}|_{\mathbb{V}}\big|\sigma_*(t) - \sigma_*(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}} + \frac{\kappa}{C_1}\big|g(t) - g(s)\big|_{C(\overline{\Omega})}|\tilde{\tau}|_{\mathbb{V}}\big|\sigma_*(t)\big|_{\mathbb{V}} \\
&\quad + \frac{\kappa}{2}\left(\big|\sigma_*(t)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 - \big|\sigma_*(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}^2\right) \\
&\le \kappa|\tilde{\tau}|_{\mathbb{V}}\big|\sigma_*(t) - \sigma_*(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}} + \frac{\kappa}{C_1}\big|g(t) - g(s)\big|_{C(\overline{\Omega})}|\tilde{\tau}|_{\mathbb{V}}|\sigma_*|_{C([0,T];\mathbb{V})} \\
&\quad + \kappa|\sigma_*|_{C([0,T];\mathbb{V})}\left(\big|\sigma_*(t)\big|_{\mathbb{V}} - \big|\sigma_*(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}\right) \\
&\le \left(\kappa\big(1 + |\sigma_*|_{C([0,T];\mathbb{V})}\big)\int_s^t \big|\sigma_*'(l)\big|_{\mathbb{V}} dl + \frac{\kappa}{C_1}|\sigma_*|_{C([0,T];\mathbb{V})}\int_s^t \big|g'(l)\big|_{C(\overline{\Omega})}\, dl\right)\big(1 + |\tilde{\tau}|_{\mathbb{V}}\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if we take $\beta_r(\cdot) := \beta(\cdot) := \kappa(1+|\sigma_*|_{C([0,T];\mathbb{V})})|\sigma_*'(\cdot)|_{\mathbb{V}} + (2/C_1)|\sigma_*|_{C([0,T];\mathbb{V})}|g'(\cdot)|_{C(\overline{\Omega})}$, then $\beta_r \in L^1(0,T)$ and (3.3) is satisfied. □

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\kappa \in (0,1]$. For any given $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} \in L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{V})$, there exists a unique solution $\sigma \in H^1(0,T;\mathbb{H}) \cap L^2(0,T;\mathbb{V})$, with $\sigma(t) \in K(t)$ for all $t \in [0,T]$, to the following problem.*

$$\sigma'(t) + \partial\varphi^t\big(\sigma(t)\big) + E_2\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(t) \ni h(t) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{H}, \text{ for a.a. } t \in (0,T), \tag{3.9}$$

$$\sigma(0) = \sigma_0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{H}. \tag{3.10}$$

Moreover, there exist positive constants M_1 and M_2, independent of κ and ν, such that

$$\big|\sigma(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \kappa\int_0^t \big|\sigma(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 ds \le M_1\left(1 + \int_0^T \big|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 ds\right), \tag{3.11}$$

$$\int_0^t \big|\sigma'(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 ds + \kappa\big|\sigma(t)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 \le M_2\left(1 + \int_0^T \big|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 ds\right) \tag{3.12}$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$.

Proof. As a result of Lemma 3.1, we can apply Proposition 3.1 to obtain the solution $\sigma \in H^1(0,T;\mathbb{H}) \cap L^2(0,T;\mathbb{V})$ of (3.9)–(3.10). Next, we obtain the uniform estimates (3.11). By the characterization (3.7) of $\partial\varphi^t$, (3.9) is equivalent to the following inequality:

$$\big(\sigma'(s), \sigma(s) - \tau\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + \kappa\big(\sigma(s), \sigma(s) - \tau\big)_{\mathbb{V}} - \big(\varepsilon\big(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\big), \sigma(s) - \tau\big)_{\mathbb{H}} \le \big(h(s), \sigma(s) - \tau\big)_{\mathbb{H}} \tag{3.13}$$

for all $\tau \in K(s)$ and for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$. From assumption (A3), we can substitute $\tau := -\sigma_*(s) \in K(s)$ in (3.13), and then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{ds}\big|\sigma(s) + \sigma_*(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \kappa\big|\sigma(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 \\
&\le -\big(\sigma_*'(s), \sigma(s) + \sigma_*(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + \big(\varepsilon\big(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\big), \sigma(s) + \sigma_*(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + \big(h(s), \sigma(s) + \sigma_*(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} \\
&\quad - \kappa\big(\sigma(s), \sigma_*(s)\big)_{\mathbb{V}} \\
&\le \frac{3}{2}\big|\sigma_*'(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \frac{3}{2}\big|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 + \frac{3}{2}\big|h(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\big|\sigma(s) + \sigma_*(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \frac{\kappa}{2}\big|\sigma(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 + \frac{\kappa}{2}\big|\sigma_*(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

that is,

$$\frac{d}{ds}\big|\sigma(s) + \sigma_*(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \le 3\big|\sigma_*'(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + 3\big|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 + 3\big|h(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \big|\sigma_*(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 + \big|\sigma(s) + \sigma_*(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2$$

for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$ with $\kappa \in (0,1]$. Now, using the Gronwall inequality, we see that there exists a constant $\tilde{M}_1$ that depends on $|\sigma_0|_{\mathbb{H}}$, $|\sigma_*(0)|_{\mathbb{H}}$, $|\sigma_*'|_{L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H})}$, $|h|_{L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H})}$, $|\sigma_*|_{L^2(0,T;\mathbb{V})}$, and T such that

$$\big|\sigma(t) + \sigma_*(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \le \tilde{M}_1\left(1 + \int_0^T \big|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 ds\right).$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$. This implies that (3.11) holds for some suitable constant $M_1 > 0$. Next, we recall the approximate problem of (3.9) using the Moreau–Yosida regularization φ_λ^t for $\lambda \in (0,1]$ as follows:

$$\varphi_\lambda^t(\tau) := \inf_{\tilde{\tau}\in\mathbb{H}}\left\{\frac{1}{2\lambda}|\tau - \tilde{\tau}|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \varphi^t(\tilde{\tau})\right\} = \frac{1}{2\lambda}|\tau - J_\lambda^t\tau|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \varphi^t(J_\lambda^t\tau),$$

where J_λ^t is the resolvent $(I + \lambda\partial\varphi^t)^{-1}$ of $\partial\varphi^t$. From Lemma 3.1 with (3.8), for each $s,t \in [0,T]$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{H}$, there exists $\tilde{\tau} \in K(t) \cap \mathbb{V}$ such that

$$|\tilde{\tau} - J_\lambda^s\tau|_{\mathbb{H}} \le \int_s^t \alpha(l)dl,$$

$$\varphi^t(\tilde{\tau}) - \varphi^s(J_\lambda^s\tau) \le \left(\int_s^t \beta(l)dl\right)\big(1 + \varphi^s(J_\lambda^s\tau)\big).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_\lambda^t(\tau) - \varphi_\lambda^s(\tau) &\le \frac{1}{2\lambda}|\tau - \tilde\tau|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \varphi^t(\tilde\tau) - \frac{1}{2\lambda}|\tau - J_\lambda^s\tau|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 - \varphi^s(J_\lambda^s\tau)\\
&= \frac{1}{2\lambda}\big(|\tau - \tilde\tau|_{\mathbb{H}} + |\tau - J_\lambda^s\tau|_{\mathbb{H}}\big)\big(|\tau - \tilde\tau|_{\mathbb{H}} - |\tau - J_\lambda^s\tau|_{\mathbb{H}}\big) + \varphi^t(\tilde\tau) - \varphi^s(J_\lambda^s\tau)\\
&\le \frac{1}{2\lambda}\big(|\tau - J_\lambda^s\tau + J_\lambda^s\tau - \tilde\tau|_{\mathbb{H}} + |\tau - J_\lambda^s\tau|_{\mathbb{H}}\big)|\tilde\tau - J_\lambda^s\tau|_{\mathbb{H}}\\
&\quad + \left(\int_s^t \beta(l)dl\right)\big(1 + \varphi^s(J_\lambda^s\tau)\big)\\
&\le |\tilde\tau - J_\lambda^s\tau|_{\mathbb{H}}\left|\frac{\tau - J_\lambda^s\tau}{\lambda}\right|_{\mathbb{H}} + \frac{1}{2\lambda}|\tilde\tau - J_\lambda^s\tau|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \big(1 + \varphi^s(J_\lambda^s\tau)\big)\int_s^t \beta(l)dl\\
&\le \big|\partial\varphi_\lambda^s(\tau)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}\int_s^t \alpha(l)dl + \frac{t-s}{2\lambda}\int_s^t \big|\alpha(l)\big|^2 dl + \big(1 + \varphi_\lambda^s(\tau)\big)\int_s^t \beta(l)dl,
\end{aligned}$$

for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$, because

$$\varphi^s(J_\lambda^s\tau) = -\frac{1}{2\lambda}|\tau - J_\lambda^s\tau|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \varphi_\lambda^s(\tau) \le \varphi_\lambda^s(\tau).$$

Then, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{ds}\varphi_\lambda^s(\tau) \le \big|\partial\varphi_\lambda^s(\tau)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}\big|\alpha(s)\big| + \big(1 + \varphi_\lambda^s(\tau)\big)\big|\beta(s)\big|$$

for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$, namely

$$\frac{d}{ds}\varphi_\lambda^s(\tilde\sigma(s)) - \big(\tilde\sigma'(s), \partial\varphi_\lambda^s\big(\tilde\sigma(s)\big)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} \le \big|\partial\varphi_\lambda^s\big(\tilde\sigma(s)\big)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}\big|\alpha(s)\big| + \big(1 + \varphi_\lambda^s\big(\tilde\sigma(s)\big)\big|\beta(s)\big|$$

for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$ and for all $\tilde\sigma \in W^{1,1}(0,T;\mathbb{H})$ (see, e.g. [12, Lemma 1.2.5.]). From this rigorous formulation, we can obtain an estimate by multiplying (3.9) by $\partial\varphi^s\big(\sigma(s)\big)$ at time $t = s$. That gives the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big|\partial\varphi^s\big(\sigma(s)\big)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \frac{d}{ds}\varphi^s\big(\sigma(s)\big)\\
&\le \big|\partial\varphi^s\big(\sigma(s)\big)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}\big|\alpha(s)\big| + \big(1 + \varphi^s\big(\sigma(s)\big)\big|\beta(s)\big| - \big(\varepsilon\big(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\big), \partial\varphi^s\big(\sigma(s)\big)\big)_{\mathbb{H}}\\
&\quad + \big(h(s), \partial\varphi^s\big(\sigma(s)\big)\big)_{\mathbb{H}}\\
&\le \frac{1}{2}\big|\partial\varphi^s\big(\sigma(s)\big)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \frac{3}{2}\big|\alpha(s)\big|^2 + \frac{3}{2}\big|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 + \frac{3}{2}\big|h(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \big(1 + \varphi^s\big(\sigma(s)\big)\big|\beta(s)\big| \qquad (3.15)
\end{aligned}$$

for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$. Actually, we need to consider the above estimate at the level of the approximate problem of (3.9) using the Moreau–Yosida regularization and execute the limiting procedure. Using the Gronwall inequality, we get $\sigma(t) \in K(t)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varphi\big(\sigma(t)\big)\\
&\le \left(\frac{1}{2}|\sigma_0|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 + \frac{3}{2}|\alpha|_{L^2(0,T)}^2 + \frac{3}{2}|h|_{L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H})}^2 + |\beta|_{L^1(0,T)} + \frac{3}{2}\int_0^T \big|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 ds\right) e^{|\beta|_{L^1(0,T)}}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$, with $\kappa \in (0,1]$. Integrating (3.15) over $[0,t]$ with respect to time, and using the above resultant, we obtain

$$\int_0^t \big|\partial\varphi^s\big(\sigma(s)\big)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 ds + \frac{\kappa}{2}\big|\sigma(t)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 \le \tilde{M}_2\left(1 + \int_0^T \big|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 ds\right)$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$, where $\tilde{M}_2$ is a positive constant depending on $|\sigma_0|_{\mathbb{H}}$, $|h|_{L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H})}$, $|\alpha|_{L^2(0,T)}$, $|\beta|_{L^1(0,T)}$, and T, but independent of $\kappa \in (0,1]$. Finally, by comparison, we obtain (3.12) for some suitable constant $M_2 > 0$. □

We now define a solution operator $S_1 : L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{V}) \to L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H})$. This assigns a unique solution $S_1\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} := \sigma$ to the above problem (3.9)–(3.10) on $[0,T]$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\nu \in (0,1]$. For any given $\tilde{\sigma} \in L^2(0,T;\mathbb{V})$, there exists a unique solution $\boldsymbol{v} \in H^1(0,T;\boldsymbol{H}) \cap L^\infty(0,T;\boldsymbol{V}) \cap L^2(0,T;H^2(\Omega)^3)$ to the following problem:*

$$\boldsymbol{v}'(t) + \partial\psi\big(\boldsymbol{v}(t)\big) + E_1\tilde{\sigma}(t) = \boldsymbol{f}(t) \quad \text{in } \boldsymbol{H},\ \text{for a.a. } t \in (0,T), \tag{3.16}$$

$$\boldsymbol{v}(0) = \boldsymbol{v}_0 \quad \text{in } \boldsymbol{H}. \tag{3.17}$$

Moreover, there exist positive constants M_3 and M_4 which are independent of ν such that

$$\big|\boldsymbol{v}(t)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 + \nu\int_0^t \big|\boldsymbol{v}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 ds \le M_3\left(1 + \int_0^T \big|\tilde{\sigma}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 ds\right),$$

$$\int_0^t \big|\boldsymbol{v}'(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 ds + \nu\big|\boldsymbol{v}(t)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 \le M_4\left(1 + \int_0^T \big|\tilde{\sigma}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 ds\right)$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$.

As the proof uses standard techniques, we omit it from this paper.

We can also define a solution operator $S_2 : L^2(0,T;\mathbb{V}) \to L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{V})$ that assigns a unique solution $S_2\tilde{\sigma} := \boldsymbol{v}$ to the above problem (3.16)–(3.17) on $[0,T]$.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 2.1.

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. We define the operator $S : L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{V}) \to L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{V})$ by $S := S_2 \circ S_1$. Let $\kappa, \nu \in (0,1]$. We show that S is a contraction operator. For $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(i)} \in L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{V})$ for $i = 1,2$, we set $\sigma^{(i)} := S_1\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(i)}$. Taking the difference between (3.9) with $\sigma^{(1)}$ and (3.10) with $\sigma^{(2)}$ at time s, and using (3.7) and the Gauss–Green relation (2.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{ds}\big|\sigma^{(1)}(s) - \sigma^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \kappa\big|\sigma^{(1)}(s) - \sigma^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 \\
&\le -\big(\mathbf{div}\big(\sigma^{(1)}(s) - \sigma^{(2)}(s)\big), \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(1)}(s) - \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(2)}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} \\
&\le \frac{\kappa}{2}\big|\sigma^{(1)}(s) - \sigma^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 + \frac{1}{2\kappa}\big|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(1)}(s) - \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2
\end{aligned}$$

for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$. Integrating this expression over $(0,t)$ with respect to time, we obtain

$$\big|\sigma^{(1)}(t)-\sigma^{(2)}(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2+\kappa\int_0^t\big|\sigma^{(1)}(s)-\sigma^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}^2ds\le\frac{1}{\kappa}\int_0^t\big|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(1)}(s)-\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2ds \tag{3.18}$$

for all $t\in[0,T]$. Next, we set $\boldsymbol{v}^{(i)}:=S_2\sigma^{(i)}$ for $i=1,2$. In the same way, taking the difference between (3.16) with $\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}$ and (3.16) with $\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}$ at time s, and using the Gauss–Green relation (2.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{ds}\big|\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}(s)-\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2+\nu\big|\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}(s)-\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2\\&\le-\big(\varepsilon\big(\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}(s)-\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}(s)\big),\sigma^{(1)}(s)-\sigma^{(2)}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}}\\&\le\frac{\nu}{2}\big|\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}(s)-\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2+\frac{1}{2\nu}\big|\sigma^{(1)}(s)-\sigma^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2,\end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\big|\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}(t)-\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}(t)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2+\nu\int_0^t\big|\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}(s)-\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2ds\le\frac{1}{\nu}\int_0^t\big|\sigma^{(1)}(s)-\sigma^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2ds \tag{3.19}$$

for all $t\in[0,T]$. Combining (3.19) with (3.18), we obtain the following inequality:

$$\nu\big|S\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(1)}-S\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(2)}\big|_{L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{V})}^2\le\frac{1}{\kappa\nu}T\big|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(1)}-\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(2)}\big|_{L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{V})}^2.$$

Taking $T_0\in(0,T]$ satisfying $(1/\kappa\nu^2)T_0<1$, we see that S is a contraction on $L^2(0,T_0;\boldsymbol{V})$. Thus, we can apply the Banach fixed point theorem to show that there exists a unique $\boldsymbol{v}\in L^2(0,T_0;\boldsymbol{V})$ such that $\boldsymbol{v}=S\boldsymbol{v}$ in $L^2(0,T_0;\boldsymbol{V})$ at once. Then, the pair $(\boldsymbol{v},\sigma)$ of $\boldsymbol{v}$ and $\sigma:=S_1\boldsymbol{v}$ is the solution in the sense of variational inequality on $[0,T_0]$. Next, recall that we can choose T_0 independent of the initial data. Taking $\boldsymbol{v}(T_0)\in\boldsymbol{V}$ and $\sigma(T_0)\in K(T_0)\cap\mathbb{V}$ as the initial data at time T_0, we can find the solution pair $(\boldsymbol{v},\sigma)$ in the sense of variational inequality on $[T_0,2T_0]$, i.e. we obtain the solution $(\boldsymbol{v},\sigma)$ in the sense of variational inequality on $[0,T]$ by iterating at finite times. □

3.3 Proof of Theorem 2.2.

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 2.2. Assumption (A4) is replaced by (A4′). From assumptions (A4′) and (A5), we can take the sequence $\{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$g_n\in H^1\big(0,T;C(\overline{\Omega})\big),\quad 0<C_1\le g_n\le C_2\quad\text{in } Q \tag{3.20}$$

for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and

$$g_n\to g\quad\text{in } C(\overline{Q}) \tag{3.21}$$

as $n\to\infty$, i.e. g_n satisfies assumptions (A4) and (A5).

From the definition of $K(0)$, we see that there exists $\tilde{\sigma}_0\in\tilde{K}(0)$ such that $\sigma_0=\tilde{\sigma}_0-\sigma_*(0)$. We define $\tilde{\sigma}_{0,n}$ by

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{0,n}(x):=\left(1-\frac{1}{C_1}\big|g_n(0)-g(0)\big|_{C(\overline{\Omega})}\right)\tilde{\sigma}_0(x)$$

for a.a. $x \in \Omega$, where the constant C_1 is the same as in (A5). Because

$$\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{\sigma}_{0,n}^D|^2 &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{C_1}\big|g_n(0) - g(0)\big|_{C(\overline{\Omega})}\right)^2 |\tilde{\sigma}_0^D|^2 \\
&\le 2\left(1 - \frac{1}{C_1}\big|g_n(0) - g(0)\big|_{C(\overline{\Omega})}\right) g(0) \\
&\le 2g(0) - \frac{2g(0)}{C_1}\big|g_n(0) - g(0)\big|_{C(\overline{\Omega})} \\
&\le 2g(0) - 2g_n(0) + 2g_n(0) - 2\big|g_n(0) - g(0)\big|_{C(\overline{\Omega})} \\
&\le 2g_n(0)
\end{aligned}$$

a.e. in Ω, $\tilde{\sigma}_{0,n} \to \tilde{\sigma}_0$ in $\mathbb{H}$ as $n \to \infty$. Using these sequences, we define a constraint set $K_n(t) := \tilde{K}_n(t) - \sigma_*(t)$ for all $t \in [0,T]$, where

$$\tilde{K}_n(t) := \left\{\tau \in \mathbb{H} : \frac{1}{2}\big|\tau^D(x)\big|^2 \le g_n(t,x) \quad \text{for a.a. } x \in \Omega\right\}.$$

Therefore, defining $\sigma_{0,n} := \tilde{\sigma}_{0,n} - \sigma_{*,n}(0)$, we can state the following lemma:

Lemma 3.2. *For the initial data σ_0, there exists a sequence $\{\sigma_{0,n}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\sigma_{0,n} \in K_n(0)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\sigma_{0,n} \to \sigma_0$ in $\mathbb{H}$ as $n \to \infty$.*

Under these settings, we see that $\sigma_{0,n}$, $\sigma_{*,n}$, g_n with $K_n(t)$ satisfy assumptions (A2), (A3), (A4), and (A5) by replacing σ_0, σ_*, g with $K(t)$, respectively. Therefore, applying Theorem 2.1, we see that there exists a unique solution $(\boldsymbol{v}_n, \sigma_n)$ in the sense of variational inequality satisfying

$$\boldsymbol{v}_n'(t) + \partial\psi\big(\boldsymbol{v}_n(t)\big) + E_1\sigma_n(t) = \boldsymbol{f}(t) \quad \text{in } \boldsymbol{H}, \text{ for a.a. } t \in (0,T), \tag{3.22}$$

$$\sigma_n'(t) + \partial(\varphi + I_{K_n(t)})\big(\sigma_n(t)\big) + E_2\boldsymbol{v}_n(t) \ni h(t) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{H}, \text{ for a.a. } t \in (0,T), \tag{3.23}$$

$$\boldsymbol{v}_n(0) = \boldsymbol{v}_0 \quad \text{in } \boldsymbol{H}, \quad \sigma_n(0) = \sigma_{0,n} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{H}.$$

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Firstly, we obtain a uniform estimate for $(\boldsymbol{v}_n, \sigma_n)$. Multiplying (3.22) by $\boldsymbol{v}_n(s)$ at time $t = s$, and using the Gauss–Green relation (2.3), we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{ds}\big|\boldsymbol{v}_n(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 + \nu\big|\boldsymbol{v}_n(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 = -\big(\sigma_n(s), \varepsilon\big(\boldsymbol{v}_n(s)\big)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + \big(\boldsymbol{f}(s), \boldsymbol{v}_n(s)\big)_{\boldsymbol{H}}$$

for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$. In addition, from (3.23) and (3.7), we have the following inequality:

$$\big(\sigma_n'(s), \sigma_n(s) - \tau\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + \kappa\big(\sigma_n(s), \sigma_n(s) - \tau\big)_{\mathbb{V}} - \big(\varepsilon\big(\boldsymbol{v}_n(s)\big), \sigma_n(s) - \tau\big)_{\mathbb{H}} \le \big(h(s), \sigma_n(s) - \tau\big)_{\mathbb{H}}$$

for all $\tau \in K(s)$ and for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$. Now, taking $\tau := -\sigma_*(s)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{ds}\big|\sigma_n(s) + \sigma_*(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \kappa\big|\sigma_n(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 \\
&\le -\big(\sigma_*'(s), \sigma_n(s) + \sigma_*(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + \big(\varepsilon\big(\boldsymbol{v}_n(s)\big), \sigma_n(s) + \sigma_*(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + \big(h(s), \sigma_n(s) + \sigma_*(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} \\
&\quad - \kappa\big(\sigma_n(s), \sigma_*(s)\big)_{\mathbb{V}}
\end{aligned}$$

for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$. Adding these expressions and using the Young inequality, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{ds}\big|\boldsymbol{v}_n(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{ds}\big|\sigma_n(s)+\sigma_*(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \frac{\nu}{2}\big|\boldsymbol{v}_n(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 + \frac{\kappa}{2}\big|\sigma_n(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}\big|\boldsymbol{f}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\big|\boldsymbol{v}_n(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 + \big|\sigma_*'(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \big|h(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \frac{1}{2\nu}\big|\sigma_*(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \frac{\kappa}{2}\big|\sigma_*(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\big|\sigma_n(s)+\sigma_*(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

By the Gronwall inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big|\boldsymbol{v}_n(t)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 + \big|\sigma_n(t)+\sigma_*(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \\
&\leq \bigg(|\boldsymbol{v}_0|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 + |\sigma_0|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \big|\sigma_*(0)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + |\boldsymbol{f}|_{L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{H})}^2 + \bigg(2+\frac{1}{\nu}\bigg)|\sigma_*|_{H^1(0,T;\mathbb{H})}^2 + 2|h|_{L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H})}^2 \\
&\quad + |\sigma_*|_{L^2(0,T;\mathbb{V})}^2\bigg)e^T
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$. Thus, there exists a positive constant $M_5(\nu)$ that depends on $\nu > 0$, but is independent of $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\big|\boldsymbol{v}_n(t)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 + \big|\sigma_n(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \nu\int_0^t \big|\boldsymbol{v}_n(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 ds + \kappa\int_0^t \big|\sigma_n(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 ds \leq M_5(\nu)$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$. Next, multiplying (3.22) by $\boldsymbol{v}_n'(s)$ at time $t = s$, and using the Gauss–Green relation (2.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|\boldsymbol{v}_n'(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 + \frac{\nu}{2}\frac{d}{ds}\big|\boldsymbol{v}_n(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 &= \big(\mathbf{div}\sigma_n(s), \boldsymbol{v}_n'(s)\big)_{\boldsymbol{H}} + \big(\boldsymbol{f}(s), \boldsymbol{v}_n'(s)\big)_{\boldsymbol{H}} \\
&\leq \big|\sigma_n(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}^2 + \big|\boldsymbol{f}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\big|\boldsymbol{v}_n'(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2
\end{aligned}$$

for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$. Integrating this expression over $[0,t]$ with respect to time, and using (3.3), we obtain

$$\int_0^t \big|\boldsymbol{v}_n'(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 ds + \nu\big|\boldsymbol{v}_n(t)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 \leq |\boldsymbol{v}_0|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 + \frac{2}{\kappa}M_5(\nu) + 2|\boldsymbol{f}|_{L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{H})}^2 := M_6(\kappa,\nu)$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$. By comparison, in (3.22), we also have

$$\int_0^t \big|\partial\psi\big(\boldsymbol{v}_n(s)\big)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 ds \leq M_7(\kappa,\nu)$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$ for some suitable positive constant $M_7(\kappa,\nu)$. Thus, there exists a subsequence $\{n_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $n_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$, $\boldsymbol{v} \in H^1(0,T;\boldsymbol{H}) \cap L^\infty(0,T;\boldsymbol{V}) \cap L^2(0,T;H^2(\Omega)^3)$, and $\sigma \in L^\infty(0,T;\mathbb{H}) \cap L^2(0,T;\mathbb{V})$ such that

$$\begin{gathered}
\boldsymbol{v}_{n_k} \to \boldsymbol{v} \quad \text{weakly star in } L^\infty(0,T;\boldsymbol{V}) \cap L^2\big(0,T;H^2(\Omega)^3\big), \\
\boldsymbol{v}_{n_k}' \to \boldsymbol{v}' \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{H}), \\
\sigma_{n_k} \to \sigma \quad \text{weakly in } L^\infty(0,T;\mathbb{H}) \cap L^2(0,T;\mathbb{V})
\end{gathered}$$

as $k \to \infty$. Moreover, from the Aubin compactness theorem (see, e.g. [23]),

$$\boldsymbol{v}_{n_k} \to \boldsymbol{v} \quad \text{in } C\big([0,T];\boldsymbol{H}\big) \cap L^2\big(0,T;\boldsymbol{V}\big) \tag{3.24}$$

as $k \to \infty$.

Secondly, to obtain strong convergence, we apply the abstract technique to the time-dependent constraint [9]. Recall that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $\tilde{\sigma}_n(t) \in \tilde{K}_n(t)$ such that $\sigma_n(t) = \tilde{\sigma}_n(t) - \sigma_*(t)$ for all $t \in [0,T]$. For each $r \in (0,1)$, there exists $N_r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$r\tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}(t) \in \tilde{K}_{n_l}(t), \quad r\tilde{\sigma}_{n_l}(t) \in \tilde{K}_{n_k}(t)$$

for all $k,l \geq N_r$ and $t \in [0,T]$. Indeed, from (3.20), we see that $g_{n_k}(t,x)/C_1 \geq 1$ for all $(t,x) \in \overline{Q}$. Moreover, from (3.21), there exists $N_r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|g_{n_k} - g_{n_l}|_{C(\overline{Q})} \leq C_1(1-r)$$

for all $k,l \geq N_r$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\big|r\tilde{\sigma}^D_{n_k}(t)\big|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \frac{|g_{n_k} - g_{n_l}|_{C(\overline{Q})}}{C_1}\right)\big|\tilde{\sigma}^D_{n_k}(t)\big|^2 \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{|g_{n_k} - g_{n_l}|_{C(\overline{Q})}}{C_1}\right) g_{n_k}(t) \\
&\leq g_{n_k}(t) - g_{n_l}(t) + g_{n_l}(t) - |g_{n_k} - g_{n_l}|_{C(\overline{Q})} \\
&\leq g_{n_l}(t)
\end{aligned}$$

a.e. in Ω for all $k,l \geq N_r$. Therefore, $r\tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}(t) \in \tilde{K}_{n_l}(t)$ and, similarly, $r\tilde{\sigma}_{n_l}(t) \in \tilde{K}_{n_k}(t)$ for all $k,l \geq N_r$. Using this fact, we now show that $\{\sigma_{n_k}\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $C([0,T];\mathbb{H})$. We know that $\sigma_{n_k}(s) := \tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}(s) - \sigma_*(s) \in K_{n_k}(s)$ satisfies (3.23) at time s. Moreover, $r\tilde{\sigma}_{n_l}(s) - \sigma_*(s) \in K_{n_k}(s)$ for all $k,l \geq N_r$. Therefore, for all $k,l \geq N_r$, testing $\sigma_{n_k}(s) - (r\tilde{\sigma}_{n_l}(s) - \sigma_*(s))$, and using (3.7), we obtain the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big(\sigma'_{n_k}(s), \tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}(s) - r\tilde{\sigma}_{n_l}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + \kappa\big(\sigma_{n_k}(s), \tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}(s) - r\tilde{\sigma}_{n_l}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{V}} \\
&\leq \big(\varepsilon\big(\boldsymbol{v}_{n_k}(s)\big), \tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}(s) - r\tilde{\sigma}_{n_l}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + \big(h(s), \tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}(s) - r\tilde{\sigma}_{n_l}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

and analogously

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big(\sigma'_{n_l}(s), \tilde{\sigma}_{n_l}(s) - r\tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + \kappa\big(\sigma_{n_l}(s), \tilde{\sigma}_{n_l}(s) - r\tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{V}} \\
&\leq \big(\varepsilon\big(\boldsymbol{v}_{n_l}(s)\big), \tilde{\sigma}_{n_l}(s) - r\tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + \big(h(s), \tilde{\sigma}_{n_l}(s) - r\tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$. Taking the sum of (3.25) and (3.26),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{ds}\big|\sigma_{n_k}(s) - \sigma_{n_l}(s)\big|^2_{\mathbb{H}} + \kappa\big|\sigma_{n_k}(s) - \sigma_{n_l}(s)\big|^2_{\mathbb{V}} \\
&\leq -(1-r)\big(\sigma'_{n_k}(s), \sigma_{n_l}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} - (1-r)\big(\sigma'_{n_l}(s), \sigma_{n_k}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + 2\kappa(1-r)\big|\sigma_{n_k}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}\big|\sigma_{n_l}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}} \\
&\quad + \big|\boldsymbol{v}_{n_k}(s) - \boldsymbol{v}_{n_l}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}\big|\sigma_{n_k}(s) - \sigma_{n_l}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}} + (1-r)\big|\boldsymbol{v}_{n_k}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}\big|\sigma_{n_l}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}} \\
&\quad + (1-r)\big|\boldsymbol{v}_{n_l}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}\big|\sigma_{n_k}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}} + (1-r)\big|h(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}\big|\sigma_{n_k}(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}} + (1-r)\big|h(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}\big|\sigma_{n_l}(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$. By virtue of the Gronwall inequality, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big|\sigma_{n_k}(t) - \sigma_{n_l}(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \\
&\le \bigg\{ \big|\sigma_{0,n_k} - \sigma_{0,n_l}\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + 2(1-r)|\sigma_{0,n_l}||\sigma_{0,n_k}|_{\mathbb{H}} + 2(1-r)\big|\sigma_{n_k}(T)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}\big|\sigma_{n_l}(T)\big|_{\mathbb{H}} \\
&\quad + 4\kappa(1-r)\int_0^T \big|\sigma_{n_k}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}}\big|\sigma_{n_l}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{V}} ds + \int_0^T \big|\boldsymbol{v}_{n_k}(s) - \boldsymbol{v}_{n_l}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 ds \\
&\quad + 2(1-r)\int_0^T \big|\boldsymbol{v}_{n_k}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}\big|\sigma_{n_l}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}} ds + 2(1-r)\int_0^T \big|\boldsymbol{v}_{n_l}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}\big|\sigma_{n_k}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}} ds \\
&\quad + 2(1-r)\int_0^T \big|h(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}\big|\sigma_{n_k}(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}} ds + 2(1-r)\int_0^T \big|h(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}\big|\sigma_{n_l}(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}} ds \bigg\} e^T
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{k,l\to\infty} \big|\sigma_{n_k}(t) - \sigma_{n_l}(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \\
&\le (1-r)\bigg\{ 8M_5(\nu) + 2\frac{M_5(\nu)}{\nu} + 4M_5(\nu)T + 2|h|_{L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H})}^2 \bigg\} e^T
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$. Letting $r \to 1$, we see that

$$\limsup_{k,l\to\infty} \big|\sigma_{n_k}(t) - \sigma_{n_l}(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 = 0$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$, that is, $\{\sigma_{n_k}\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $C([0,T];\mathbb{H})$ and $\sigma \in C([0,T];\mathbb{H})$. Next, integrating (3.27) over $[0,T]$ with respect to time, taking $\limsup_{k,l\to\infty}$, and letting $r \to 1$, we finally obtain that

$$\sigma_{n_k} \to \sigma \quad \text{in } C\big([0,T];\mathbb{H}\big) \cap L^2(0,T;\mathbb{V}), \quad \sigma_{n_k} \to \sigma \quad \text{a.e. in } Q \tag{3.28}$$

as $k \to \infty$, and $\sigma(0) = \sigma_0$ in $\mathbb{H}$. Thus, setting $\tilde{\sigma} := \sigma + \sigma_*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\big|\tilde{\sigma}^D(x)\big|^2 &= \frac{1}{2}\big|(\sigma - \sigma_{n_k} + \sigma_{n_k} + \sigma_*)^D(x)\big|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\big|(\sigma - \sigma_{n_k})^D(x) + \tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}^D(x)\big|^2 \\
&\le \frac{1}{2}\big|(\sigma - \sigma_{n_k})^D(x)\big|^2 + \big|(\sigma - \sigma_{n_k})^D(x)\big|\big|\tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}^D(x)\big| + \frac{1}{2}\big|\tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}^D(x)\big|^2 \\
&\le \frac{1}{2}\big|(\sigma - \sigma_{n_k})^D(x)\big|^2 + \big|(\sigma - \sigma_{n_k})^D(x)\big|\big|\tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}^D(x)\big| + g_{n_k}(t,x)
\end{aligned}$$

for a.a. $x \in \Omega$. Letting $k \to \infty$, we then obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\big|\tilde{\sigma}^D(x)\big|^2 \le g(t,x)$$

for a.a. $x \in \Omega$, that is, $\sigma(t) \in K(t)$ for a.a. $t \in (0,T)$.

Finally, we show that the pair $(\boldsymbol{v}, \sigma)$ satisfies the weak variational inequality (2.5). For each test function $\eta \in \mathcal{K}_0$, there exists a function $\tilde{\eta} : (0,T) \to \mathbb{H}$ such that $\tilde{\eta}(t) \in \tilde{K}(t)$ and $\eta(t) = \tilde{\eta}(t) - \sigma_*(t)$ for a.a. $t \in (0,T)$. Moreover, from assumption (A3), we see that $\tilde{\eta} = \eta + \sigma_* \in H^1(0,T;\mathbb{H}) \cap L^2(0,T;\mathbb{V})$. Now, for each $r \in (0,1)$, there exists $N_r^* \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$r\tilde{\eta}(t) \in \tilde{K}_{n_k}(t)$$

for all $k \geq N_r^*$ and $t \in [0,T]$. Indeed, from (3.20), we see that $g_{n_k}(t,x)/C_1 \geq 1$ for all $(t,x) \in \overline{Q}$. Moreover, from (3.21) there exists $N_r^* \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|g_{n_k} - g|_{C(\overline{Q})} \leq C_1(1-r)$$

for all $k \geq N_r^*$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\big|r\tilde{\eta}^D(t)\big|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \frac{|g_{n_k} - g|_{C(\overline{Q})}}{C_1}\right)\big|\tilde{\eta}^D(t)\big|^2 \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{|g_{n_k} - g|_{C(\overline{Q})}}{C_1}\right) g(t) \\
&\leq g(t) - g_{n_k}(t) + g_{n_k}(t) - |g_{n_k} - g|_{C(\overline{Q})} \\
&\leq g_{n_k}(t)
\end{aligned}$$

a.e. in Ω for all $k \geq N_r$, namely $r\tilde{\eta}(t) \in \tilde{K}_{n_k}(t)$ for all $k \geq N_r$. Now, for all $k \geq N_r$, taking $\tau := r\tilde{\eta}(s) - \sigma_*(s) \in K_{n_k}(s)$ in (3.24) at time s and integrating the resultant over $(0,t)$ with respect to time, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^t \big(\sigma'_{n_k}(s), \tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}(s) - \tilde{\eta}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds + (1-r)\int_0^t \big(\sigma'_{n_k}(s), \tilde{\eta}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds \\
&+ \kappa \int_0^t \big(\sigma_{n_k}(s), \tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}(s) - \tilde{\eta}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{V}} ds + (1-r)\kappa \int_0^t \big(\sigma_{n_k}(s), \tilde{\eta}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{V}} ds \\
&- \int_0^t \big(\varepsilon\big(\boldsymbol{v}_{n_k}(s)\big), \tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}(s) - \tilde{\eta}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds - (1-r)\int_0^t \big(\varepsilon\big(\boldsymbol{v}_{n_k}(s)\big), \tilde{\eta}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds \\
&\quad \leq \int_0^t \big(h(s), \tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}(s) - \tilde{\eta}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds + (1-r)\int_0^t \big(h(s), \tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}(s) - \tilde{\eta}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds
\end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$. Here, as we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^t \big(\sigma'_{n_k}(s), \tilde{\sigma}_{n_k}(s) - \tilde{\eta}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds \\
&= \int_0^t \big(\sigma'_{n_k}(s) - \eta'(s), \sigma_{n_k}(s) - \eta(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds + \int_0^t \big(\eta'(s), \sigma_{n_k}(s) - \eta(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\big|\sigma_{n_k}(t) - \eta(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 - \frac{1}{2}\big|\sigma_0 - \eta(0)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \int_0^t \big(\eta'(s), \sigma_{n_k}(s) - \eta(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1-r)\int_0^t \big(\sigma'_{n_k}(s), \tilde{\eta}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds \\
&= (1-r)\big(\sigma_{n_k}(t), \tilde{\eta}(t)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} - (1-r)\big(\sigma_0, \tilde{\eta}(0)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + (1-r)\int_0^t \big(\sigma_{n_k}(s), \tilde{\eta}'(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$, we let $k \to \infty$ in (3.29) with the convergence shown in (3.24), (3.28) and deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^t \big(\eta'(s), \sigma(s) - \eta(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds + \kappa \int_0^t \big(\sigma(s), \sigma(s) - \eta(s)\big)_{\mathbb{V}} ds \\
&- \int_0^t \big(\varepsilon\big(\boldsymbol{v}(s)\big), \sigma(s) - \eta(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds + \frac{1}{2}\big|\sigma(t) - \eta(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \\
&\quad \le \int_0^t \big(h(s), \sigma(s) - \eta(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds + \frac{1}{2}\big|\sigma_0 - \eta(0)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \\
&\qquad - (1-r)\big(\sigma(t), \tilde{\eta}(t)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + (1-r)\big(\sigma_0, \tilde{\eta}(0)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} - \int_0^t \big(\sigma(s), \tilde{\eta}'(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds \\
&\qquad - (1-r)\kappa \int_0^t \big(\sigma(s), \tilde{\eta}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{V}} ds + (1-r) \int_0^t \big(\varepsilon\big(\boldsymbol{v}(s)\big), \tilde{\eta}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds \\
&\qquad + (1-r) \int_0^t \big(h(s), \sigma(s) - \eta(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} ds
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$. Thus, letting $r \to 1$, we see that $(\boldsymbol{v}, \sigma)$ satisfies the weak variational inequality (2.5). It is clear that $(\boldsymbol{v}, \sigma)$ satisfies (2.4). Therefore, $(\boldsymbol{v}, \sigma)$ is a solution in the sense of weak variational inequality.

The proof of the uniqueness in the sense of weak variational inequality is the same as in [9, Theorem 2.1]. Therefore, we omit it from this paper. □

4 Pure perfect plasticity model

In the final section, we discuss the existence problem for the pure perfect plasticity model.

4.1 Auxiliary problems

Conisider two auxiliary problems for the pure perfect plasticity model. It is clear that $I_{K(t)}$ is a lower semicontinuous functional on $\mathbb{H}$. Moreover, we can take the same function $\alpha \in L^2(0,T)$ as in Lemma 3.1. Therefore, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *The set of proper, lower semicontinuous, and convex functions $\{I_{K(t)}\}$ satisfies condition* (H).

Using Lemma 4.1, we can apply Proposition 3.1 again to obtain the solution $\sigma \in H^1(0,T;\mathbb{H})$ of the following form.

Proposition 4.1. *For any given $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} \in L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{V})$, there exists a unique solution $\sigma \in H^1(0,T;\mathbb{H})$, with $\sigma(t) \in K(t)$ for all $t \in [0,T]$, to the following problem.*

$$\sigma'(t) + \partial I_{K(t)}\big(\sigma(t)\big) + E_2\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(t) \ni h(t) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{H}, \text{ for a.a. } t \in (0,T), \tag{4.30}$$

$$\sigma(0) = \sigma_0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{H}. \tag{4.31}$$

Moreover, there exist positive constants M_6 and M_7, independent of ν, such that

$$\left|\sigma(t)\right|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \le M_6 \left(1 + \int_0^T \left|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\right|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 ds\right), \tag{4.32}$$

$$\int_0^t \left|\sigma'(s)\right|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 ds \le M_7 \left(1 + \int_0^T \left|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\right|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 ds\right) \tag{4.33}$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$.

Proof. The proof of existence comes from Proposition 3.1. Here, we consider the uniform estimate. By the definition of the subdifferential, (4.30) is equivalent to the following inequality:

$$\big(\sigma'(s), \sigma(s) - \tau\big)_{\mathbb{H}} - \big(\varepsilon\big(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\big), \sigma(s) - \tau\big)_{\mathbb{H}} \le \big(h(s), \sigma(s) - \tau\big)_{\mathbb{H}} \tag{4.34}$$

for all $\tau \in K(s)$ and for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$. From assumption (A3), we can substitute $\tau := -\sigma_*(s) \in K(s)$ in (4.34) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{ds}\left|\sigma(s) + \sigma_*(s)\right|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \\
&\le -\big(\sigma_*'(s), \sigma(s) + \sigma_*(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + \big(\varepsilon\big(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\big), \sigma(s) + \sigma_*(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + \big(h(s), \sigma(s) + \sigma_*(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} \\
&\le \frac{3}{2}\left|\sigma_*'(s)\right|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \frac{3}{2}\left|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\right|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 + \frac{3}{2}\left|h(s)\right|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left|\sigma(s) + \sigma_*(s)\right|_{\mathbb{H}}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\frac{d}{ds}\left|\sigma(s) + \sigma_*(s)\right|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \le 3\left|\sigma_*'(s)\right|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + 3\left|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\right|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 + 3\left|h(s)\right|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \left|\sigma(s) + \sigma_*(s)\right|_{\mathbb{H}}^2$$

for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$. Now, using the Gronwall inequality, we see that there exists a constant $\tilde{M}_6$ that depends on $|\sigma_0|_{\mathbb{H}}$, $|\sigma_*(0)|_{\mathbb{H}}$, $|\sigma_*'|_{L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H})}$, $|h|_{L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H})}$, and T such that

$$\left|\sigma(t) + \sigma_*(t)\right|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \le \tilde{M}_6 \left(1 + \int_0^T \left|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\right|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 ds\right).$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$. This implies (4.32) holds for some suitable constant $M_6 > 0$. Next, we recall the the approximate problem of (4.30) using the Moreau–Yosida regularization $I_{K(s)}^{\lambda}$ for $\lambda \in (0,1]$. If we let $P_{K(s)}$ be the projection on $K(s)$, this is the same as the resolvent $(I + \lambda \partial I_{K(s)})^{-1}$. From Lemma 4.1, for each $s,t \in [0,T]$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{H}$, there exists $\tilde{\tau} \in K(t)$ such that

$$|\tilde{\tau} - P_{K(s)}\tau|_{\mathbb{H}} \le \int_s^t \alpha(l) dl.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
I^\lambda_{K(t)}(\tau) - I^\lambda_{K(s)}(\tau) &\le \frac{1}{2\lambda}|\tau-\tilde\tau|^2_{\mathbb{H}} - \frac{1}{2\lambda}|\tau - P_{K(s)}\tau|^2_{\mathbb{H}} \\
&= \frac{1}{2\lambda}\big(|\tau-\tilde\tau|_{\mathbb{H}} + |\tau-P_{K(s)}\tau|_{\mathbb{H}}\big)\big(|\tau-\tilde\tau|_{\mathbb{H}} - |\tau-P_{K(s)}\tau|_{\mathbb{H}}\big) \\
&\le \frac{1}{2\lambda}\big(|\tau - P_{K(s)}\tau + P_{K(s)}\tau - \tilde\tau|_{\mathbb{H}} + |\tau-P_{K(s)}\tau|_{\mathbb{H}}\big)|\tilde\tau - P_{K(s)}\tau|_{\mathbb{H}} \\
&\le |\tilde\tau - P_{K(s)}\tau|_{\mathbb{H}}\left|\frac{\tau - P_{K(s)}\tau}{\lambda}\right|_{\mathbb{H}} + \frac{1}{2\lambda}|\tilde\tau - P_{K(s)}\tau|^2_{\mathbb{H}} \\
&\le \big|\partial I_{K(s)}(\tau)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}\int_s^t \alpha(l)dl + \frac{t-s}{2\lambda}\int_s^t \big|\alpha(l)\big|^2 dl.
\end{aligned}$$

This means that

$$\frac{d}{ds}I^\lambda_{K(s)}(\tau) \le \big|\partial I_{K(s)}(\tau)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}\big|\alpha(s)\big|$$

for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$, namely

$$\frac{d}{ds}I^\lambda_{K(s)}(\tilde\sigma(s)) - \big(\tilde\sigma'(s), \partial I^\lambda_{K(s)}\big(\tilde\sigma(s)\big)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} \le \big|\partial I^\lambda_{K(s)}(\tilde\sigma)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}\big|\alpha(s)\big|$$

for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$ and for all $\tilde\sigma \in W^{1,1}(0,T;\mathbb{H})$. As a result of this rigorous estimate, we can multiply (4.30) by $\partial I_{K(s)}(\sigma(s))$ at time $t = s$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big|\partial I_{K(s)}\big(\sigma(s)\big)\big|^2_{\mathbb{H}} + \frac{d}{ds}I_{K(s)}\big(\sigma(s)\big) \\
&\le \big|\partial I_{K(s)}\big(\sigma(s)\big)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}\big|\alpha(s)\big| - \big(\varepsilon\big(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\big), \partial I_{K(s)}\big(\sigma(s)\big)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + \big(h(s), \partial I_{K(s)}\big(\sigma(s)\big)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} \\
&\le \frac{1}{2}\big|\partial I_{K(s)}\big(\sigma(s)\big)\big|^2_{\mathbb{H}} + \frac{3}{2}\big|\alpha(s)\big|^2 + \frac{3}{2}\big|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\big|^2_{\boldsymbol{V}} + \frac{3}{2}\big|h(s)\big|^2_{\mathbb{H}}
\end{aligned}$$

for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$. Integrating the above resultant over $[0,t]$ with respect to time, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t \big|\partial I_{K(s)}\big(\sigma(s)\big)\big|^2_{\mathbb{H}} ds + 2I_{K(t)}\big(\sigma(t)\big) &\le 3\int_0^T \big|\alpha(s)\big|^2 ds + 3\int_0^T \big|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\big|^2_{\boldsymbol{V}} ds + 3\int_0^T \big|h(s)\big|^2_{\mathbb{H}} ds \\
&\le \tilde M_7\left(1 + \int_0^T \big|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}(s)\big|^2_{\boldsymbol{V}} ds\right)
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$, where $\tilde M_7 := \max\{3, |\alpha|^2_{L^2(0,T)} + |h|^2_{L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H})}\}$. Finally, by comparison, we obtain (4.33) with some suitable constant $M_7 > 0$. □

We now define a solution operator $S_3 : L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{V}) \to L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H})$ that assigns a unique solution $S_3\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} := \sigma$ to the above problem (4.30)–(4.31) on $[0,T]$.

Define $E_3 : \mathbb{H} \to \boldsymbol{V}^*$ by

$$\langle E_3\tau, \boldsymbol{z}\rangle_{\boldsymbol{V}^*,\boldsymbol{V}} := \big(\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{z}), \tau\big)_{\mathbb{H}} \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{z} \in \boldsymbol{V}.$$

If $E_3\tau \in \boldsymbol{H}$ then, from (2.3), we have $E_3\tau = E_1\tau$. We consider the following auxiliary problem.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\nu \in (0,1]$. For any given $\tilde{\sigma} \in L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H})$, there exists a unique solution $\boldsymbol{v} \in H^1(0,T;\boldsymbol{V}^*) \cap L^\infty(0,T;\boldsymbol{H}) \cap L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{V})$ to the following problem:*

$$\boldsymbol{v}'(t) + \partial\psi\big(\boldsymbol{v}(t)\big) + E_3\tilde{\sigma}(t) = \boldsymbol{f}(t) \quad \text{in } \boldsymbol{V}^*, \text{ for a.a. } t \in (0,T), \tag{4.35}$$

$$\boldsymbol{v}(0) = \boldsymbol{v}_0 \quad \text{in } \boldsymbol{H}. \tag{4.36}$$

Moreover, there exists a positive constant M_8 that is independent of ν such that

$$\big|\boldsymbol{v}(t)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 + \nu\int_0^t \big|\boldsymbol{v}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 ds \le M_8\left(1 + \frac{1}{\nu}\int_0^T \big|\tilde{\sigma}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 ds\right) \tag{4.37}$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$.

Proof. The proof of existence is quite standard. Therefore, we omit it from this paper. We show the uniform estimates. Multiplying (4.35) by $\boldsymbol{v}(s)$ at time $t = s$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{ds}\big|\boldsymbol{v}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 + \nu\big|\boldsymbol{v}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 &= -\big(\tilde{\sigma}(s), \varepsilon\big(\boldsymbol{v}(s)\big)\big)_{\mathbb{H}} + \big(\boldsymbol{f}(s), \boldsymbol{v}(s)\big)_{\boldsymbol{H}} \\ &\le \frac{1}{2\nu}\big|\tilde{\sigma}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 + \frac{\nu}{2}\big|\boldsymbol{v}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\big|\boldsymbol{f}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\big|\boldsymbol{v}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2\end{aligned}$$

for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$. Therefore, using the Gronwall inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\boldsymbol{v}(t)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 &\le \left(\big|\boldsymbol{v}_0\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 + \frac{1}{\nu}\int_0^T \big|\tilde{\sigma}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 ds + \int_0^T \big|\boldsymbol{f}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 ds\right) e^T \\ &\le \tilde{M}_8\left(1 + \frac{1}{\nu}\int_0^T \big|\tilde{\sigma}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 ds\right)\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$, where $\tilde{M}_8 := e^T \max\{1, |\boldsymbol{v}_0|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2 + |\boldsymbol{f}|_{L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{H})}^2\}$ and

$$\nu\int_0^t \big|\boldsymbol{v}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 ds \le M_8\left(1 + \frac{1}{\nu}\int_0^T \big|\tilde{\sigma}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 ds\right)$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$. Thus, we have (4.37) for some suitable constant $M_8 > 0$. □

We can also define a solution operator $S_4 : L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H}) \to L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{V})$ that assigns a unique solution $S_4\tilde{\sigma} := \boldsymbol{v}$ to the above problem (4.35)–(4.36) on $[0,T]$.

4.2 Proof of Theorem 2.3.

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 2.3 in a similar manner to the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. We define the operator $S : L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{V}) \to L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{V})$ by $S := S_4 \circ S_3$. Let $\nu \in (0,1]$. We show that S is a contraction operator. For $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(i)} \in L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{V})$ for $i = 1,2$, we set $\sigma^{(i)} := S_3\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(i)}$. Taking the difference between (4.30) with $\sigma^{(1)}$ and (4.31) with $\sigma^{(2)}$ at time s and using the monotonicity of the subdifferential, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{ds}\big|\sigma^{(1)}(s)-\sigma^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 &\le \big(\varepsilon(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(1)}(s)-\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(2)}(s)\big),\sigma^{(1)}(s)-\sigma^{(2)}(s)\big)_{\mathbb{H}}\\ &\le \frac{1}{2}\big|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(1)}(s)-\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2+\frac{1}{2}\big|\sigma^{(1)}(s)-\sigma^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2\end{aligned}$$

for a.a. $s \in (0,T)$. Using the Gronwall inequality, we obtain

$$\big|\sigma^{(1)}(t)-\sigma^{(2)}(t)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \le e^T\int_0^t\big|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(1)}(s)-\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 ds \tag{4.38}$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$. Next, we set $\boldsymbol{v}^{(i)} := S_4\sigma^{(i)}$ for $i = 1,2$. In the same way, taking the difference between (4.35) with $\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}$ and (4.35) with $\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}$ at time s, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{ds}\big|\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}(s)-\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2+\nu\big|\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}(s)-\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2\\ &\le -\big(\sigma^{(1)}(s)-\sigma^{(2)}(s),\varepsilon\big(\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}(s)-\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}(s)\big)\big)_{\mathbb{H}}\\ &\le \frac{1}{2\nu}\big|\sigma^{(1)}(s)-\sigma^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2+\frac{\nu}{2}\big|\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}(s)-\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2,\end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\big|\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}(t)-\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}(t)\big|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2+\nu\int_0^t\big|\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}(s)-\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\boldsymbol{V}}^2 ds \le \frac{1}{\nu}\int_0^t\big|\sigma^{(1)}(s)-\sigma^{(2)}(s)\big|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 ds$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$. Combining (4.38) with (4.2), we obtain the following inequality:

$$\nu\big|S\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(1)}-S\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(2)}\big|_{L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{V})}^2 \le \frac{e^T}{\nu}T\big|\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(1)}-\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(2)}\big|_{L^2(0,T;\boldsymbol{V})}^2.$$

Taking $T_0 \in (0,T]$ satisfying $(e^T/\nu^2)T_0 < 1$, we see that S is a contraction on $L^2(0,T_0;\boldsymbol{V})$. Thus, we can apply the method of proof used in Theorem 2.1 to show Theorem 2.3. □

Remark. The approach to the pure perfect plasticity model is the same as in previous work [7, Chapter V]. There, the limiting problem $\nu \to 0$ was also considered. However, when the constraint set depends on time, our proof strategy does not work for the problem $\nu \to 0$. This is because we do not know how to treat the term

$$\big(\partial I_{K(t)}\big(\sigma(t)\big)',\sigma'(t)\big)_{\mathbb{H}}$$

rigorously (cf. [7, p.243]).

Acknowledgments

The present paper benefits from the support of the JSPS KAKENHI Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research(C), Grant Number 26400164 for TF.

References

[1] M. Biroli, Sur les inéquations paraboliques avec convexe dépendant du temps: solution forte et solution faible, Riv. Mat. Univ. Parma (3), **3** (1974), 33–72.

[2] M. Biroli, Sur une inequation parabolique avec convexe dependant du temps, Ricerche Mat., **23** (1974), 203–222.

[3] S. Boettcher, M. Böhm and M. Wolff, Well-posedness of a thermo-elasto-plastic problem with phase transitions in TRIP steels under mixed boundary conditions, ZAMM Z. Angew. Math. Mech., **95** (2015), 1461–1476.

[4] H. Brézis, Un probléme d'evolution avec contraintes unilatérales dépendant du temps, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Sér A, **274** (1972), 310–312.

[5] M. Brokate, P. Krejčí and H. Schnabel, On uniqueness in evolution quasivariational inequalities, J. Convex Anal., **11** (2004), 111–130.

[6] K. Chełmiński and R. Racke, Mathematical analysis of thermoplasticity with linear kinematic hardening, J. Appl. Anal., **12** (2006), 37–57.

[7] G. Duvaut and J. L. Lions, *Inequalities in mechanics and physics*, Springer-Verlag, 1976.

[8] T. Fukao and N. Kenmochi, Abstract theory of variational inequalities and Lagrange multipliers, pp. 237–246 in *Discrete and continuous dynamical systems, supplement 2013*, 2013.

[9] T. Fukao and N. Kenmochi, Parabolic variational inequalities with weakly time-dependent constraint, Adv. Math. Sci. Appl., **23** (2013), 365–395.

[10] R. Kano, Y. Murase and N. Kenmochi, Nonlinear evolution equations generated by subdifferentials with nonlocal constraints, pp.175–194 in *Nonlocal and abstract parabolic equations and their applications*, **Vol.86**, Banach Center Publications, 2009.

[11] N. Kenmochi, Some nonlinear parabolic variational inequalities, Israel J. Math., **22** (1975), 304–331.

[12] N. Kenmochi, Solvability of nonlinear evolution equations with time-dependent constraints and applications, Bull. Fac. Ed. Chiba Univ., **30** (1981), 1–87,

[13] P. Krejčí, *Hysteresis, convexity and dissipation in hyperbolic equations*, Gakuto Intarnat. Ser. Math. Sci. Appl., **8** Gakkotosho, Tokyo, 1996.

[14] P. Krejčí and Ph. Laurençot, Generalized variational inequalities, J. Convex Anal., **9** (2002), 159–183.

[15] P. Krejčí and M. Liero, Rate independent Kurzweil processes, Appl. Math., **54** (2009), 117–145.

[16] P. Krejčí and T. Roche, Lipschitz continuous data dependence of sweeping processes in BV spaces, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B, **15** (2011), 637–650.

[17] M. Kunze and M. D. P. Monteiro Marques, On parabolic quasi-variational inequalities and state-dependent sweeping processes, Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal., **12** (1998), 179–191.

[18] M. D. P. Monteiro Marques, *Differential inclusions in nonsmooth mechanical problems, shocks and dry friction*, Progr. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl., Birkhäuser, Boston, 1993.

[19] J. J. Moreau, Rafle par un convexe variable (Premiére partie), pp. 1–43 in *Travaux du Séminaire d'Analyse Convexe*, Montpellier, 1971.

[20] J. J. Moreau, Evolution problem associated with a moving convex set in a Hilbert spaces, J. Differential Equations, **26** (1977), 347–374.

[21] V. Recupero, A continuity method for sweeping processes, J. Differential Equations, **251** (2011), 2125–2142.

[22] V. Recupero, BV continuous sweeping processes, J. Differential Equations, **259** (2015), 4253–4272.

[23] J. Simon, Compact sets in the spaces $L^p(0,T;B)$, Ann. Mat. Pura. Appl. (4), **146** (1987), 65–96.

[24] R. E. Showalter, *Monotone operators in Banach spaces and nonlinear partial differential equations*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, Vol.49, American Mathematical Society, 1997.

[25] U. Stefanelli, Some quasivariational problems with memory, Boll. Unione Mat. Ital. Sez. B Artic. Ric. Mat. (8), **7** (2004), 319–333.

[26] A. Vladimirov, Equicontinuous sweeping processes, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B, **18** (2013), 565–573.

[27] Y. Yamada, On evolution equations generated by subdifferential operators, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math., **23** (1976), 491–515.